arXiv:1405.4371v2 [math.OC] 8 Sep 2014

A Dai–Yuan-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method with the weak Wolfe conditions

Hiroyuki Sato*
Department of Applied Management Science
Tokyo University of Science, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

September 9, 2014

Abstract

In this article, a new Riemannian conjugate gradient method is developed together with global convergence analysis. The existing Fletcher–Reeves-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method is guaranteed to have global convergence if it is implemented with the strong Wolfe conditions. On the other hand, the Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient method generates globally convergent sequences under the weak Wolfe conditions. This article deals with a generalization of Dai–Yuan's Euclidean algorithm to a Riemannian algorithm that needs not the strong but just the weak Wolfe conditions. The global convergence property of the proposed method is proved by means of the scaled vector transport associated with the differentiated retraction.

Keywords: Riemannian optimization; Conjugate gradient method; Global convergence; Weak Wolfe conditions; Scaled vector transport

1 Introduction

The Euclidean non-linear conjugate gradient method [6] for minimizing a non-linear objective function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ without any constraints is a generalization of the linear conjugate gradient method proposed by Hestenes and Stiefel [5]. The steepest descent method, which is the simplest iterative optimization method, does not need the Hessian of the objective function, but its speed of convergence is very slow in general. Newton's method has a property of locally quadratic convergence, but not of global convergence. Additionally, we need to compute the Hessian of the objective function at each step in Newton's method. On the other hand, the conjugate gradient method has properties of global convergence and locally superlinear convergence, and is much faster than the steepest descent method. Furthermore, it does not need the Hessian of the objective function. Therefore, the conjugate gradient method is one of the most important optimization methods and has been intensively researched.

The non-linear conjugate gradient method in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ is characterized by its computation of search directions. The search direction η_k at the current iterate $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is computed by

$$\eta_k = -\nabla f(x_k) + \beta_k \eta_{k-1}, \qquad k \geq 0, \tag{1.1}$$

*hsato@ms.kagu.tus.ac.jp

where $\beta_0 = 0$ and β_k is a parameter that determines the property of the conjugate gradient method. There are different varieties of choices of β_k and a good choice of β_k allows the method to have good convergence. As with other iterative optimization methods, once a search direction is computed, the next iterate x_{k+1} is computed by

$$x_{k+1} = x_k + \alpha_k \eta_k, \tag{1.2}$$

where the step size $\alpha_k > 0$ is computed such that α_k approximately satisfies

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k \eta_k) \approx \min_{\alpha > 0} \{f(x_k + \alpha \eta_k)\}. \tag{1.3}$$

One of the frequently used rules for computing such a step size is the Wolfe rule. Under the Wolfe rule, α_k at the k-th iterate is computed such that α_k satisfies the Wolfe conditions

$$f(x_k + \alpha_k \eta_k) \leq f(x_k) + c_1 \alpha_k \nabla f(x_k)^T \eta_k, \tag{1.4}$$

$$\nabla f(x_k + \alpha_k \eta_k)^T \eta_k \geq c_2 \nabla f(x_k)^T \eta_k \tag{1.5}$$

for predetermined constants c_1 and c_2 with $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$. To avoid confusion with the strong Wolfe conditions, which are more strict, we refer to the Wolfe conditions (1.4) and (1.5) as the weak Wolfe conditions.

We are interested in how to choose a good β_k in (1.1). A well-known choice is

$$\beta_k^{\mathrm{FR}} = \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T \nabla f(x_k)}{\nabla f(x_{k-1})^T \nabla f(x_{k-1})} \tag{1.6}$$

proposed by Fletcher and Reeves [4]. If the step sizes are computed so as to satisfy the strong Wolfe conditions, the conjugate gradient method with β_k^{FR} has global convergence. In [2], Dai and Yuan proposed a refinement of β_k^{FR} as

$$\beta_k^{\mathrm{DY}} = \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T \nabla f(x_k)}{\eta_{k-1}^T y_k}, \qquad y_k = \nabla f(x_k) - \nabla f(x_{k-1}). \tag{1.7}$$

An advantage of β_k^{DY} is that the conjugate gradient method with β_k^{DY} has global convergence when implemented with only the weak Wolfe conditions. There is no longer a need to assume that each step size satisfies the strong Wolfe conditions.

Beyond unconstrained optimization methods in Euclidean space, Riemannian optimization, which is optimization on Riemannian manifolds, has been developed recently [1, 3]. Unconstrained optimization methods such as the steepest descent and Newton's methods have been generalized to those on Riemannian manifolds. The conjugate gradient method has been generalized to that on Riemannian manifolds to some extent as well, but remains in the stage of development. In [1], Absil, Mahony, and Sepulchre introduced the notion of a vector transport to implement a Riemannian conjugate gradient method. By means of a vector transport, Ring and Wirth performed global convergence analysis of the Fletcher–Reeves-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method under a certain assumption [7]. Sato and Iwai introduced the notion of a scaled vector transport, developed an improved method, and proved a global convergence property of the new method without the assumption made in [7].

The purposes of this article are to propose a new choice of β_k of the Riemannian conjugate gradient method based on the Dai–Yuan β_k^{DY} of the Euclidean conjugate gradient method,

and to prove the global convergence property of the proposed algorithm under the weak Wolfe conditions.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce several geometric objects necessary for Riemannian optimization. A Riemannian version of the weak Wolfe conditions, which are important in our algorithm, is also defined. In Section 3, we review the Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient method and discuss how to generalize β_k^{DY} to β_k on a Riemannian manifold. Against expectations, a natural generalization of (1.7) fails to develop a Riemannian analogy of the Dai–Yuan algorithm. Therefore, we take a different approach based on another expression of (1.7) and propose a new algorithm. Section 4 provides a global convergence analysis of the present algorithm analogous to a discussion in [2]. The notion of a scaled vector transport introduced in [8] plays an important role in the analysis. Section 5 provides concluding remarks.

2 General Riemannian optimization and Riemannian conjugate gradient method

In this section, we briefly review Riemannian optimization, especially the Riemannian conjugate gradient method. Our problem is as follows.

Problem 2.1.

$$\text{minimize} \quad f(x), \tag{2.1}$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad x \in M, \tag{2.2}$$

where M is a Riemannian manifold endowed with a Riemannian metric $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the norm of a tangent vector $\xi \in T_xM$ is defined to be $\|\xi\|_x = \sqrt{\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_x}$, and where f is a smooth objective function.

In Riemannian optimization, we have to replace several quantities used in Euclidean optimization with appropriate quantities on the Riemannian manifold $(M, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ in question. For example, the search direction η_k at the current point $x_k \in M$ has to be a tangent vector at x_k to M. In iterative optimization methods on M, we perform a line search on appropriate curves on M. Such a curve should be emanating from x_k in the direction of η_k and can be defined by means of a retraction. A retraction is defined as follows [1].

Definition 2.1. *Let M and TM be a manifold and the tangent bundle of M, respectively. Let $R : TM \to M$ be a smooth map and R_x the restriction of R to T_xM. R is called a retraction on M, if it has the following properties.*

1. *$R_x(0_x) = x$, where 0_x denotes the zero element of T_xM.*
2. *With the canonical identification $T_{0_x}T_xM \simeq T_xM$, R_x satisfies*

$$\mathrm{D}R_x(0_x) = \mathrm{id}_{T_xM}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathrm{D}R_x(0_x)$ denotes the derivative of R_x at 0_x, and id_{T_xM} the identity map on T_xM.

Using a retraction, the updating formula for iterative Riemannian optimization methods can be written as

$$x_{k+1} = R_{x_k}(\alpha_k \eta_k), \tag{2.4}$$

where the step size α_k is computed so as to satisfy a certain condition. Throughout this article, we consider the weak Wolfe conditions

$$f\left(R_{x_k}(\alpha_k\eta_k)\right) \leq f(x_k) + c_1\alpha_k\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\langle \operatorname{grad} f\left(R_{x_k}(\alpha_k\eta_k)\right), \mathrm{D}R_{x_k}\left(\alpha_k\eta_k\right)[\eta_k]\rangle_{R_{x_k}(\alpha_k\eta_k)} \geq c_2\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$ [7, 8]. We here note that grad f on a general Riemannian manifold M is no longer the Euclidean gradient. In fact, grad f is the vector field on M and depends on the Riemannian metric.

In generalizing the Euclidean conjugate gradient method to that on a manifold M, the right-hand side of (1.1) cannot be computed since $\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) \in T_{x_k}M$ and $\eta_{k-1} \in T_{x_{k-1}}M$; that is, the two terms on the right-hand side of (1.1) belong to different tangent spaces.

In [1], the notion of a vector transport is introduced to transport a tangent vector to another tangent space.

Definition 2.2. *A vector transport $\mathcal{T}$ on a manifold M is a smooth map*

$$TM \oplus TM \to TM : (\eta, \xi) \mapsto \mathcal{T}_\eta(\xi) \in TM \tag{2.7}$$

satisfying the following properties for all $x \in M$.

1. *There exists a retraction R, called the retraction associated with $\mathcal{T}$, such that*

$$\pi\left(\mathcal{T}_\eta(\xi)\right) = R_x\left(\eta\right), \qquad \eta, \xi \in T_xM, \tag{2.8}$$

   where $\pi\left(\mathcal{T}_\eta(\xi)\right)$ denotes the foot of the tangent vector $\mathcal{T}_\eta(\xi)$,

2. *$\mathcal{T}_{0_x}(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in T_xM$,*

3. *$\mathcal{T}_\eta(a\xi + b\zeta) = a\mathcal{T}_\eta(\xi) + b\mathcal{T}_\eta(\zeta)$ for all $\eta, \xi, \zeta \in T_xM$.*

We can generalize (1.1) using a vector transport $\mathcal{T}$ on M as

$$\eta_k = -\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) + \beta_k\mathcal{T}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \qquad k \geq 0, \tag{2.9}$$

or equivalently,

$$\eta_k = -\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) + \beta_k\mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \qquad k \geq 0, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\mathcal{T}^{(k)} := c_k\mathcal{T}$ and c_k is a positive number. We have just replaced β_k with $\beta_k c_k$ in (2.9) to obtain (2.10). However, the latter expression (2.10) is more useful in our discussion. We will propose a new choice of β_k in Section 3.

A reasonable choice of a vector transport is the differentiated retraction $\mathcal{T}^R$ defined by

$$\mathcal{T}^R_\eta(\xi) := \mathrm{D}R_x(\eta)[\xi], \qquad x \in M,\ \eta, \xi \in T_xM. \tag{2.11}$$

Note that the second condition (2.6) of the weak Wolfe conditions can be rewritten using $\mathcal{T}^R$ as

$$\langle \operatorname{grad} f\left(R_{x_k}(\alpha_k\eta_k)\right), \mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{R_{x_k}(\alpha_k\eta_k)} \geq c_2\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}. \tag{2.12}$$

Furthermore, the scaled vector transport $\mathcal{T}^0$ associated with $\mathcal{T}^R$ [8], which is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}^0_\eta(\xi) = \frac{\|\xi\|_x}{\|\mathcal{T}^R_\eta(\xi)\|_{R_x(\eta)}}\mathcal{T}^R_\eta(\xi), \qquad x \in M,\ \eta, \xi \in T_xM, \tag{2.13}$$

is important in the global convergence analysis of our new algorithm. Note that $\mathcal{T}^0$ has the important property

$$\|\mathcal{T}^0_\eta(\xi)\|_{R_x(\eta)} = \|\xi\|_x, \qquad \eta, \xi \in T_xM. \tag{2.14}$$

3 Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient method and its Riemannian generalization

3.1 Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient method

The conjugate gradient method on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with β_k^{DY} defined by (1.7), which was proposed by Dai and Yuan [2], has global convergence under the assumption that each step size α_k satisfies the weak Wolfe conditions (1.4) and (1.5). Since the Fletcher–Reeves-type conjugate gradient method has to be implemented with the strong Wolfe conditions, β_k^{DY} is an improved version of β_k^{FR}. We wish to develop a good analogy of β_k^{DY} on Riemannian manifolds.

It should be noted that, in Euclidean space, we can show the equality

$$\beta_k^{\mathrm{DY}} = \frac{\nabla f(x_k)^T \eta_k}{\nabla f(x_{k-1})^T \eta_{k-1}} \tag{3.1}$$

using Eq. (1.1). These two equivalent expressions (1.7) and (3.1) of β_k^{DY} are useful in the global convergence analysis of the Dai–Yuan-type algorithm in [2].

3.2 New Riemannian conjugate gradient method based on Euclidean Dai–Yuan β

Throughout this subsection, we assume that all the quantities that appear in denominators of fractions are nonzero. However, this assumption can be finally removed when we propose a new algorithm at the end of this section. See Prop. 4.1 for more detail. For simplicity, in some of the following computations, we use the notation

$$g_k = \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \qquad k \geq 0. \tag{3.2}$$

We expect a Riemannian analogy of the Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient method to have global convergence if the step sizes satisfy just the weak Wolfe conditions.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a general vector transport on M. Assume that we use $\mathcal{T}^{(k)} := c_k \mathcal{T}$ and the update formula (2.10) at the k-th iteration, where c_k is a positive number. To generalize the right-hand side of (1.7), it seems natural to define $\hat{y}_k \in T_{x_k} M$ by

$$\hat{y}_k = \operatorname{grad} f(x_k) - \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1})) \tag{3.3}$$

as an analogy of the Euclidean version of y_k, since $\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) \in T_{x_k} M$ and $\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1}) \in T_{x_{k-1}} M$ belong to different tangent spaces. The right-hand side of β_k^{DY} in (1.7) can then be generalized to

$$\hat{\beta}_k := \frac{\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k}^2}{\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \hat{y}_k \rangle_{x_k}}. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that $\eta_{k-1} \in T_{x_{k-1}} M$ and $\hat{y}_k \in T_{x_k} M$ belong to different tangent spaces and we cannot take the inner product of η_{k-1} and $\hat{y}_k$ directly.

Furthermore, the right-hand side of (3.1), which is equivalent to (1.7) in the Euclidean case, can be generalized to

$$\check{\beta}_k := \frac{\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}}{\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1}), \eta_{k-1} \rangle_{x_{k-1}}}. \tag{3.5}$$

We here note that Eq. (3.5) itself cannot be used in a conjugate gradient algorithm since η_k in the right-hand side of (3.5) should be computed by using $\check{\beta}_k$. We need to derive an expression of $\check{\beta}_k$ which does not contain η_k. To this end, we obtain from (2.10) and (3.5) that

$$\check{\beta}_k = \frac{\langle g_k, -g_k + \check{\beta}_k \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1})\rangle_{x_k}}{\langle g_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}\rangle_{x_{k-1}}} = \frac{-\|g_k\|^2_{x_k} + \check{\beta}_k \langle g_k, \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1})\rangle_{x_k}}{\langle g_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}\rangle_{x_{k-1}}}. \tag{3.6}$$

It follows that

$$\check{\beta}_k = \frac{\|\mathrm{grad}\, f(x_k)\|^2_{x_k}}{\langle \mathrm{grad}\, f(x_k), \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1})\rangle_{x_k} - \langle \mathrm{grad}\, f(x_{k-1}), \eta_{k-1}\rangle_{x_{k-1}}}. \tag{3.7}$$

Strictly speaking, (3.7) is a necessary condition for (3.5). Since we can directly define $\check{\beta}_k$ as (3.7), not as (3.5), and since η_k in the right-hand side of (3.5) should be computed by using $\check{\beta}_k$, we again need to check that $\check{\beta}_k$ defined by (3.7) indeed satisfies (3.5).

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that each $\check{\beta}_k$ and search direction η_k are computed by* (3.7) *and* (2.10) *with $\mathcal{T}^{(k)} := c_k \mathcal{T}$, respectively, where $\mathcal{T}$ is a vector transport on M and $c_k > 0$. Assume also that for all $k \geq 0$, $\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), \mathrm{grad}\, f(x_{k+1})\rangle_{x_{k+1}} \neq \langle \mathrm{grad}\, f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}$, hence $\check{\beta}_k$ is well defined by* (3.7). *Furthermore, assume that for all $k \geq 0$,*

$$\langle \mathrm{grad}\, f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k} \neq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Then, $\check{\beta}_k$ defined by (3.7) *satisfies* (3.5).

Proof. It follows from (2.10) and (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle_{x_{k+1}} = \langle g_{k+1}, -g_{k+1} + \check{\beta}_{k+1}\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} \\
=& -\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}} + \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}} \langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} \\
=& \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}} \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k} = \check{\beta}_{k+1}\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

This equality and the assumption $\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k} \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$ yield that $\check{\beta}_k$ satisfies (3.5). This ends the proof. □

So far we obtained two possibilities (3.4) and (3.7) in defining a new β_k. They are the same in the Euclidean case since $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$ is the identity map in $\mathbb{R}^n$. However, the two quantities $\hat{\beta}_k$ and $\check{\beta}_k$ are not the same on a general Riemannian manifold M. We look more closely at these quantities. Suppose that $\hat{\beta}_k = \check{\beta}_k$ for all k with a general choice of $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$. Then, η_k in (3.4) and in (3.7) are the same. Thus, the denominators in (3.4) and in (3.7) are also the same. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& \langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \hat{y}_k\rangle_{x_k} - \left(\langle g_k, \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1})\rangle_{x_k} - \langle g_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}\rangle_{x_{k-1}}\right) \\
=& \langle g_{k-1}, \eta_{k-1}\rangle_{x_{k-1}} - \langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(g_{k-1}), \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1})\rangle_{x_k}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

This equation is a contradiction since we cannot in general guarantee that $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$ is isometric unless $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$ is the parallel translation along a geodesic. Therefore, $\hat{\beta}_k$ is not equal to $\check{\beta}_k$ in general.

Instead of $\hat{\beta}_k$ and $\hat{y}_k$, we can show that $\check{\beta}_k$ is in fact equal to a similar quantity $\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k}^2 / \langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \check{y}_k \rangle_{x_k}$, with $\check{y}_k \in T_{x_k}M$ defined by

$$\check{y}_k = \operatorname{grad} f(x_k) - \frac{\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1}), \eta_{k-1} \rangle_{x_{k-1}}}{\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1})), \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}) \rangle_{x_k}} \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k-1})). \tag{3.11}$$

Proposition 3.2. *Assume all the assumptions in Prop. 3.1 other than* (3.8)*. Additionally, assume that for all* $k \geq 0$*,*

$$\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)), \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k) \rangle_{x_{k+1}} \neq 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Then, it holds that

$$\check{\beta}_k = \frac{\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k}^2}{\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k-1)}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \check{y}_k \rangle_{x_k}}, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\check{y}_k$ *is defined by* (3.11)*.*

Proof. From the assumption (3.12) for all $k \geq 0$, $\check{y}_k$ is well defined by Eq. (3.11). It also follows from (3.11) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), \check{y}_{k+1} \rangle_{x_{k+1}} &= \left\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), g_{k+1} - \frac{\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}}{\langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(g_k), \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k) \rangle_{x_{k+1}}} \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(g_k) \right\rangle_{x_{k+1}} \\
&= \langle \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), g_{k+1} \rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

which implies that the denominators in the right-hand sides of (3.7) and (3.13) are the same. This completes the proof. □

As will be discussed in Section 4, the right-hand side of Eq. (3.7), $\check{\beta}_k$, is well defined when we use the step sizes satisfying the weak Wolfe conditions (2.5) and (2.6). However, $\check{y}_k$, and hence the right-hand side of (3.13), are not always guaranteed to be well defined since we cannot assure the inequality (3.12) for all $k \geq 0$ in general.

Therefore, our strategy is to define a new β_k as $\check{\beta}_k$ using (3.7), not using (3.13). Furthermore, similar to the Fletcher–Reeves-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method proposed in [8], we use the scaled vector transport $\mathcal{T}^0$ associated with the differentiated retraction $\mathcal{T}^R$ only when $\mathcal{T}^R$ increases the norm of the search vector. We propose a new algorithm as follows.

Algorithm 3.1 A scaled Dai–Yuan-type Riemannian conjugate gradient method for Problem 2.1 on a Riemannian manifold M

1: Choose an initial point $x_0 \in M$.
2: Set $\eta_0 = -\operatorname{grad} f(x_0)$.
3: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ **do**
4: Compute the step size $\alpha_k > 0$ satisfying the weak Wolfe conditions (2.5) and (2.6) with $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 1$. Set

$$x_{k+1} = R_{x_k}(\alpha_k \eta_k), \tag{3.15}$$

where R is a retraction on M.
5: Set

$$\beta_{k+1} = \frac{\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1})\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1}), \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}}, \tag{3.16}$$

$$\eta_{k+1} = -\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1}) + \beta_{k+1}\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), \tag{3.17}$$

where $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), & \text{if } \|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}} \le \|\eta_k\|_{x_k}, \\ \mathcal{T}^0_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

and where $\mathcal{T}^R$ and $\mathcal{T}^0$ are the differentiated retraction and the associated scaled vector transport defined by (2.11) and (2.13), respectively.
6: **end for**

We note that (3.18) is well defined because when we choose $\mathcal{T}^0$ at the k-th iteration, it holds that $\|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}} > \|\eta_k\|_{x_k} \ge 0$ and the quantity $\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}/\|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}}$ is well defined.

We further mention that (3.18) can also be written as

$$\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k) = c_k\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k), \quad c_k = \min\left\{1, \frac{\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}}{\|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}}}\right\}. \tag{3.19}$$

Thus, we obtain the important inequality [8]

$$\|\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k\eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}} \le \|\eta_k\|_{x_k}, \tag{3.20}$$

which is essential in the global convergence analysis of our new algorithm.

So far we have observed the validity of defining β_k as (3.7), not as (3.13). Even though they are equal to each other with Eq. (2.10) under the assumption (3.12), $\check{\beta}_k$ has the advantage that it can be defined without the assumption (3.12).

4 Global convergence analysis of the proposed new algorithm

In this section, we prove the global convergence property of the proposed algorithm. We first describe our assumption about the objective function f.

Assumption 4.1. *The objective function f is bounded below and of C^1-class, and there exists a Lipschitzian constant $L > 0$ such that*

$$|\mathrm{D}(f \circ R_x)(t\eta)[\eta] - \mathrm{D}(f \circ R_x)(0)[\eta]| \le Lt,\ \eta \in T_xM,\ \|\eta\|_x = 1,\ x \in M,\ t \ge 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Examples of f and conditions about f for which this assumption holds are given in [8].

We review a Riemannian analogy of Zoutendijk's theorem. See [7, 8] for more detail.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that a sequence $\{x_k\}$ on a Riemannian manifold M is generated by a general iterative optimization algorithm; that is, by Eq. (2.4) with a retraction R on M. Suppose also that η_k satisfies $\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} < 0$ and that α_k satisfies the weak Wolfe conditions (2.5) and (2.6). If Assumption 4.1 is satisfied, then the following series converges;*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \cos^2 \theta_k \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k}^2 < \infty, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\cos\theta_k$ is defined by

$$\cos\theta_k = -\frac{\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}}{\|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k} \|\eta_k\|_{x_k}}. \tag{4.3}$$

To show that β_k in Algorithm 3.1, and hence the algorithm itself, are well defined, we prove that the search direction η_k is a descent direction; that is, $\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} < 0$. We here note that in [2], the definition (1.7) of β_k^{DY}, which is a Euclidean analogy of the expression Eq. (3.13), is fully used to prove that the Euclidean Dai–Yuan-type conjugate gradient method generates descent search directions. However, we cannot use (3.13), which is not well defined in general. Therefore, we can use only (3.7). Note that if $\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} \neq 0$, (3.7) is equivalent to (3.5) from Prop. 3.1. In the proof of the next proposition, we have to take a different approach from that in [2].

Proposition 4.1. *If $\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, then Algorithm 3.1 is well defined and two inequalities hold with the algorithm:*

$$\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} < 0, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} < \langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1}), \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k) \rangle_{x_{k+1}}. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The proof is by induction. For $k = 0$, the first inequality (4.4) follows directly from $\eta_0 = -g_0$. We shall prove (4.5) for $k = 0$. If $\langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} \geq 0$, it immediately follows that

$$\langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} \geq 0 > \langle g_0, \eta_0 \rangle_{x_0}. \tag{4.6}$$

If $\langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} < 0$, and hence $\langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{R}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} < 0$, it then follows from the second condition (2.6) of the weak Wolfe conditions with $0 < c_2 < 1$ and (3.19) that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{(0)}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} =& \min\left\{1, \frac{\|\eta_0\|_{x_0}}{\|\mathcal{T}^{R}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0)\|_{x_1}}\right\} \langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{R}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} \\ \geq& \langle g_1, \mathcal{T}^{R}_{\alpha_0 \eta_0}(\eta_0) \rangle_{x_1} \geq c_2 \langle g_0, \eta_0 \rangle_{x_0} > \langle g_0, \eta_0 \rangle_{x_0}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where we have used the fact that (2.6) is equivalent to (2.12). Thus, (4.5) for $k = 0$ is proved and β_1 is well defined by (3.16).

Suppose next that β_k is well defined by the right-hand side of (3.7) and that both inequalities (4.4) and (4.5) hold for some k. Note that β_{k+1} is well defined from the assumption (4.4) for k. The left-hand side of (4.4) for $k + 1$ is then calculated as

$$\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1} \rangle_{x_{k+1}} = \langle g_{k+1}, -g_{k+1} + \beta_{k+1} \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k) \rangle_{x_{k+1}}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= - \|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}} + \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}} \langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} \\
&= \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}} \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle_{x_k}} < 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}
$$

where we have used inequalities (4.4) and (4.5) for k. This means that (4.4) for $k+1$ holds. It then follows from a similar discussion to (4.6) and (4.7) that

$$
\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle_{x_{k+1}} < \langle g_{k+2}, \mathcal{T}^{(k+1)}_{\alpha_{k+1} \eta_{k+1}}(\eta_{k+1})\rangle_{x_{k+2}}. \tag{4.9}
$$

This completes the proof. □

The following corollary immediately follows from (4.5).

Corollary 4.1. *In Algorithm 3.1, if* $\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) \neq 0$ *for all* $k \geq 0$*, then we have* $\beta_k > 0$ *for all* $k \geq 1$.

We shall proceed to our main theorem. The proof is performed in a manner analogous to the Euclidean version in [2] with the aid of a scaled vector transport as in [8].

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $\{x_k\}$ *be a sequence generated by Algorithm 3.1. If Assumption 4.1 is satisfied, then we have*

$$
\liminf_{k \to \infty} \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k} = 0. \tag{4.10}
$$

Proof. We first note that from Prop. 4.1, all the assumptions in Thm. 4.1 are satisfied. Therefore, we have

$$
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle^2_{x_k}}{\|\eta_k\|^2_{x_k}} < \infty. \tag{4.11}
$$

If $g_{k_0} = 0$ for some k_0, then $\beta_{k_0} = 0$, followed by $\eta_{k_0} = 0$ and $x_{k_0+1} = R_{x_{k_0}}(0) = x_{k_0}$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove (4.10) only when $g_k \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$. In such a case, it follows from (3.17) that

$$
\eta_{k+1} + g_{k+1} = \beta_{k+1} \mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k). \tag{4.12}
$$

Taking the norms and squaring, we obtain

$$
\|\eta_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}} = \beta^2_{k+1} \|\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\|^2_{x_{k+1}} - 2\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}. \tag{4.13}
$$

This equality together with (4.4) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|\eta_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle^2_{x_{k+1}}} &= \frac{\|\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle^2_{x_k}} - \frac{2}{\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle_{x_{k+1}}} - \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle^2_{x_{k+1}}} \\
&= \frac{\|\mathcal{T}^{(k)}_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\|^2_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle^2_{x_k}} - \left(\frac{1}{\|g_{k+1}\|_{x_{k+1}}} + \frac{\|g_{k+1}\|_{x_{k+1}}}{\langle g_{k+1}, \eta_{k+1}\rangle_{x_{k+1}}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}} \\
&\leq \frac{\|\eta_k\|^2_{x_k}}{\langle g_k, \eta_k\rangle^2_{x_k}} + \frac{1}{\|g_{k+1}\|^2_{x_{k+1}}},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}
$$

where we have used the inequality (3.20) and the fact that β_{k+1} is equal to the right-hand side of (3.5) for $k+1$ since $\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k} \neq 0$ from (4.4). We thus arrive at the relation

$$\frac{\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}^2}{\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{\|g_i\|_{x_i}^2} + \frac{\|\eta_0\|_{x_0}^2}{\langle g_0, \eta_0 \rangle_{x_0}^2} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \frac{1}{\|g_i\|_{x_i}^2}. \tag{4.15}$$

We are now in a position to prove (4.10) by contradiction. Since we are now assuming $\operatorname{grad} f(x_k) \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, supposing (4.10) does not hold means that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|g_k\|_{x_k} \geq C, \qquad k \geq 0. \tag{4.16}$$

From (4.15) and (4.16), we obtain

$$\frac{\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}^2}{\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}^2} \leq \frac{k+1}{C^2}. \tag{4.17}$$

This leads to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{\langle g_k, \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}^2}{\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}^2} \geq C^2 \sum_{k=0}^{N} \frac{1}{k+1} \to \infty, \qquad N \to \infty, \tag{4.18}$$

which contradicts (4.11). This proves the theorem. □

5 Concluding Remarks

We have proposed a new Riemannian conjugate gradient method based on the Dai–Yuan-type Euclidean conjugate gradient algorithm. To generalize $\beta_k^{\mathrm{DY}} = \nabla f(x_k)^T \nabla f(x_k) / \eta_{k-1}^T y_k$ in the Dai–Yuan algorithm, we have used the notion of a vector transport. However, a seemingly natural generalization $\hat{\beta}_k = \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_k)\|_{x_k}^2 / \langle \mathcal{T}_{\alpha_{k-1}\eta_{k-1}}(\eta_{k-1}), \hat{y}_k \rangle_{x_k}$ is in fact not appropriate for a Riemannian algorithm. To resolve this matter, we have exploited another expression of β_k^{DY} to propose a new β_k, and hence a new Riemannian conjugate gradient method.

We have proved that the proposed algorithm is well defined and that sequences generated by the algorithm are globally convergent. The notion of a scaled vector transport plays an essential role in the convergence analysis. An advantage of our algorithm is that we do not have to search for the step sizes satisfying the strong Wolfe conditions, which are necessary conditions for the existing Fletcher–Reeves-type algorithm, and have only to compute the step sizes with the weak Wolfe conditions.

In Prop. 3.2, we have derived another expression of the proposed β_k, which is an analogy of the definition of the Euclidean Dai–Yuan β_k^{DY}. It is also worth pointing out that the role of the scaled vector transport in Algorithm 3.1 may be imposed on β_k. Putting the scaling factor $\min\left\{1, \|\eta_k\|_{x_k} / \|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}}\right\}$ on β_{k+1}, we can rewrite the computations in Step 5 of Algorithm 3.1 as

$$c_k = \min\left\{1, \frac{\|\eta_k\|_{x_k}}{\|\mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k)\|_{x_{k+1}}}\right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\bar{\beta}_{k+1} = \frac{c_k \|\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1})\|_{x_{k+1}}^2}{c_k \langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1}), \mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k) \rangle_{x_{k+1}} - \langle \operatorname{grad} f(x_k), \eta_k \rangle_{x_k}}, \tag{5.2}$$

$$\eta_{k+1} = -\operatorname{grad} f(x_{k+1}) + \bar{\beta}_{k+1} \mathcal{T}^R_{\alpha_k \eta_k}(\eta_k). \tag{5.3}$$

Having such different expressions can lead us to further developments of other Riemannian conjugate gradient methods.

References

[1] P.-A. Absil, R. Mahony, and R. Sepulchre, *Optimization Algorithms on Matrix Manifolds*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008.

[2] Y.-H. Dai and Y. Yuan, *A nonlinear conjugate gradient method with a strong global convergence property*, SIAM J. Optim., 10 (1999), pp. 177–182.

[3] A. Edelman, T. A. Arias, and S. T. Smith, *The geometry of algorithms with orthogonality constraints*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 20 (1998), pp. 303–353.

[4] R. Fletcher and C. M. Reeves, *Function minimization by conjugate gradients*, Comput. J., 7 (1964), pp. 149–154.

[5] M. R. Hestenes and E. Stiefel, *Methods of conjugate gradients for solving linear systems*, J. Res. Natl. Bur. Stand., 49 (1952).

[6] J. Nocedal and S. Wright, *Numerical Optimization, Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering*, 2006.

[7] W. Ring and B. Wirth, *Optimization methods on Riemannian manifolds and their application to shape space*, SIAM J. Optim., 22 (2012), pp. 596–627.

[8] H. Sato and T. Iwai, *A new, globally convergent Riemannian conjugate gradient method*, Optimization, (DOI:10.1080/02331934.2013.836650, ahead of print).